



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,216	11/20/2001	Joseph P. Perrone	2320.65992	9706

7590 08/23/2004

Patrick G. Burns  
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.  
Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,216

Applicant(s)

PERRONE ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to application filed November 20, 2001 in which claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 12 can not depend from itself. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-13 and 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al. (U. S. 6,081,900) in view of Kirsch (U. S. 5,870,546).

Regarding claim 1, Subramaniam discloses in a data communication system having a network (Fig.1 and corresponding text, Subramaniam), at least one originating domain (106, Fig.1) through which content can be requested, a content distribution facility (104, Fig.1) through which the content can be accessed according to defined access criteria, the access criteria including a location of the originating domain, a location of the content distribution facility, at least one authorized user having means for satisfying the access criteria, and at least one unauthorized user that can not satisfy the access criteria, a method for controlling access to the content comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2171

- a selected user requesting selected content through the originating domain (104, Fig.1), the originating domain providing the selected user with a referral to the content distribution facility (106, Fig.1; col. 6, lines 40-45 and lines 61-63, Subramaniam),
- the selected user requesting the selected content from the content distribution facility using the referral and the access criteria (see col.8, lines 13-23, Subramaniam),
- the content distribution facility verifying whether the access criteria are present to determine whether the selected user is authorized or unauthorized, and
- allowing the selected user, if authorized, to retrieve the selected content through the content distribution facility (see col.8, lines 40-57, Subramaniam).

Subramaniam, however, does not disclose “a location of the requested content”.

Kirsch discloses a web server computer system provides for server based controlled management over a client reference to a resource locator including the location of requested content (see col.4, lines 13-30, Kirsch).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Subramaniam to include the claimed feature as taught by Kirsch. The motivation of doing so would have been to efficiently control the secure access to data stored (see col.3, lines 1-6, Subramaniam).

Regarding claim 15, Subramaniam discloses a data communication system comprising:

- a network (Fig.1 and corresponding text, Subramaniam),

Art Unit: 2171

- at least one originating domain (106, Fig.1) through which content can be requested,
- a content distribution facility (104, Fig.1) through which the content can be accessed according to defined access criteria, the access criteria including a location of the originating domain, a location of the content distribution facility,
- at least one authorized user having means for satisfying the access criteria, and at least one unauthorized user that can not satisfy the access criteria (see col.8, lines 40-57, Subramaniam), wherein a selected user requests selected content through the originating domain, the originating domain providing the selected user with a referral to the content distribution facility ,
- the selected user requests the selected content from the content distribution facility using the referral and the access criteria (col. 6, lines 40-45 and lines 61-63, col.8, lines 40-57, Subramaniam),
- the content distribution facility verifies whether the access criteria are present to determine whether the selected user is authorized or unauthorized, and the selected user, if authorized, is allowed to retrieve the selected content through the content distribution facility (see col.8, lines 40-57, Subramaniam).

Subramaniam, however, does not disclose “a location of the requested content”.

Kirsch discloses a web server computer system provides for server based controlled management over a client reference to a resource locator including the location of requested content (see col.4, lines 13-30, Kirsch).

Art Unit: 2171

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Subramaniam to include the claimed feature as taught by Kirsch. The motivation of doing so would have been to efficiently control the secure access to data stored (see col.3, lines 1-6, Subramaniam).

Regarding claims 2 and 16, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the access criteria include a password that may be used by one or more of the authorized users (see col.8, lines 50-53, Subramaniam).

Regarding claims 3 and 17, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the access criteria includes a location of a second originating domain (see col.10, lines 35-40, Kirsch).

Regarding claims 4 and 18, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the content is stored in memory (see col. 10, lines 6-11, Kirsch).

Regarding claims 5 and 19, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the content is live information.

Regarding claims 6 and 20, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the access criteria is defined by a station manager administration interface (see col.10, lines 56-57, Subramaniam).

Regarding claims 7-8 and 21-22, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination does not disclose a list of authorized and unauthorized referral domains. Subramaniam, however, discloses a secure URL and non-secure URL (col. 7, lines 47-58, Kirsch) that reads on the authorized and unauthorized referral domains.

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 9 and 23, The method of claim 6, wherein the access criteria includes a list of authorized source reverse domains (see col. 9, lines 18-31, Kirsch).

Regarding claims 10 and 24, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the access criteria include a list of unauthorized reverse source domains (see col. 9, lines 32-43, Kirsch).

Regarding claims 11 and 25, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the access criteria can include a sub-domain of the root domain (see col. 4, lines 32-34, Kirsch).

Regarding claims 12 and 26, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the content is requested or exchanged through a secured link, the secured link having an encrypted session via key exchange (see col.4, lines 53-57, Subramaniam).

Regarding claims 13 and 27, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination further discloses that the location is an Internet link (see col. 9, lines 18-31, Subramaniam).

2. Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al. (U. S. 6,081,900) in view of Kirsch (U. S. 5,870,546) and further in view of Stone et al. (U. S. 6,101,510).

Regarding claims 14 and 28, Subramaniam/Kirsch combination does not disclose that the referral includes a MIME tag.

Stone disclose a web browser control for incorporating web browser functionality into application programs includes a MIME (see col.16, lines 44-54, Stone).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination system of Subramaniam and Kirsch to include the claimed feature as taught by Stone. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide the flexibility and

Art Unit: 2171

ability to get access to the content of a web page in the communication network (see col. 4, lines 13-28, Stone).

*Conclusion*

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Garritty et al. (US 6,745,237) disclose a method and apparatus for managing delivery of multimedia content in a communication system.

Blumenau (US 6,108,637) discloses a content display monitor system.

Wang et al. (US 6,173,406) disclose authentication systems, methods, and computer program products.

Fields et al. (US 6,605,120) disclose a filter definition for distribution mechanism for filtering, formatting and reuse of web based content.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 2171

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Thai  
Art unit 2171  
May 4, 2004



**UYEN LE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**